



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

BISHOP DOANE AND AMERICAN ROMAN CATHOLICS.

THE answer made by the Bishop of Albany to Mr. George Parsons Lathrop's paper on "Hostility to Roman Catholics" in the May number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW is of great interest to American Roman Catholics, who give allegiance to no country but their own. Bishop Doane's utterance manifests the man of education and cultivation, fair-minded, frank, typical of his class. That his words are representative gives them their chief interest in the eyes of Catholics like myself, who are most anxious to discover the reasons why our religion is looked on with suspicion by many who love us personally, and in whose hospitality and kindness we have a cordial and brotherly share. If Bishop Doane were a fanatic or a bigot, his words would simply fill us with despair and indignation. But the Bishop of Albany manifests every disposition to be fair. His words have evidently been weighed and the thoughts they reveal are long thoughts; in fact, they seem to be the convictions of a lifetime. He is an exponent of the broadest non-Catholics in our country. And I have heard it said that there could not be a more Christian or honorable spokesman for cultivated non-Catholic opinion on the relations of American Roman Catholics to the Pope and the Government of the United States.

Still, it is hard to understand why, if Bishop Doane represents their opinions, all Americans of his education and position have not raised their voices night and day against the existence of Catholics in this country. If he states correctly the convictions of some of the best of our fellow-citizens concerning our relations to the Church and State, logical men can hardly excuse them for not banding together, following, of course, more honorable and open methods than the A. P. A. folk, and attempting to extirpate the Catholic Church from this country. As the Bishop of Albany really believes what he says about the position of Catholics in this country, it is difficult to imagine how he reconciles the almost sympathetic tone he uses towards us with our cardinal sin as he sees it.

Many bishops and noble lords and squires of all degrees belonging to that church of which Queen Victoria is the head and Bishop Doane an eminent ecclesiastic have held such views, and consequently persecuted the Catholic Church with conscientious fervor. I say conscientious with emphasis, for, according to Father Busenbaum, of the Society of Jesus, "When men who have been brought up in heresy are persuaded from boyhood that we impugn and attack the word of God, that we are idolaters, pestilent deceivers, and therefore are to be shunned as pestilences, they cannot, while this persuasion lasts, with a safe conscience hear us." And, to go further, how can they

look on us as worthy of confidence as their fellow-citizens if we are governed in all duties of every-day life by a foreign despot, who claims, not only spiritual and moral, but temporal power over us?

If we are, as Bishop Doane believes, the slaves of an alien temporal prince who is unqualified in his assertion of his right to temporal sovereignty and imperial domination and universal control, then the A. P. A. people are justified in their attitude so far as that attitude does not include lies or forgeries and wilful malice. If Bishop Doane honestly believes that Leo XIII. can at any moment order the Catholics of this country to oppose even by force of arms any political measure which may be abhorrent to him, how can he by any stretch of casuistry keep himself from "howling with the wolves" who are now making some parts of the West temporarily hideous?

What doctrine of expediency ought to prevent educated Protestants, whom Bishop Doane represents, from ostracizing every man who says "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," and who holds that in extraordinary utterances the Pope is infallible? Let us say temperately how far we Catholics deserve the opinion Bishop Doane has of us.

In the Holy Gospel of St. Mark, as given in the Vulgate, we find these words, spoken after Christ had recognized the image and the inscription on the penny which the Sadducees had brought him,—"*Reddite igitur quae sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari; et quæ sunt Dei, Deo.*" This is paraphrased in a quotation which the Bishop makes from a Catholic source,—"We are bound to obey the laws of the state when they are not contrary to the laws of God." Bishop Doane, speaking of his fellow-citizens, asks, "Who is to interpret this?" If it were left to the private judgment of individuals, or to a political party, or to a secular organization, he would see no immediate cause for alarm; but when the decision is made "by an ecclesiastic organization, nay by a single ecclesiastic claiming sovereignty, temporal as well as spiritual, and accepted and recognized as infallible, the case is enormously aggravated."

Bishop Doane does not mean to imply that the laws of all states are always infallible, and that there ought never to be a conflict between a conviction and a law; nor does he mean to say that the dictum of a political caucus would be more likely to be right on matters of civic importance than that of any ecclesiastical organization—a Board of Bishops, for instance. Ministers are obliged to settle cases of conscience every day for people in their charge. There are, no doubt, ministers and groups of ministers in Albany, under the Bishop's jurisdiction, who do this. In England, when the conscience of certain Ritualists came into conflict with the law of the land, there were men of very similar religious opinions to those of Bishop Doane, who held that the state should be defied. There are many conceivable cases in which the Bishop himself would doubtless refuse to obey a law of Cæsar's because of that "higher law" which is owned by all enlightened consciences. He, however, would probably not do so until he had consulted his friends and guided his conduct by their opinions, and perhaps by the ecclesiastical traditions of his church.

No Catholic yields *absolute* obedience to the Church or to the Pope. No Pope claims temporal sovereignty beyond the territory which was his as a temporal ruler. No Pope claims infallibility in directing the matters of every-day life. No Pope, unless by the consent of nations, could appear among them in the capacity of their temporal head. The Pope is infallible

in matters of faith and morals when he teaches the whole Church as the living voice of Christ. But he cannot make new dogmas. He has never done so. As an infallible teacher his power is limited to the already revealed word of God. The Pope cannot make a moral issue out of a merely political one. No word of his could force American Catholic soldiers to throw down their arms in a cause which they believed to be just. It is hardly possible that a Pope like Alexander VI. can ever reign, unless Platonism and luxury and ambition, like Dante's three beasts, should possess themselves of the human side of the Church at Rome. Alexander VI., in his desire to aggrandize his son, was as infallible as most doting fathers are. In his treatment of Savonarola he was very fallible and very peccable. And the Catholic world, not affected by "Roman malaria" of the time that hung about the base of Peter's column, held him to be so. He was, nevertheless, infallible when he taught from St. Peter's chair in matters spiritual.

If one of the most intellectual men in Europe, Louis XIII., saw an opportunity of gaining the good will of America towards the establishment of his rule, untrammeled by vexatious laws in Rome, by declaring—let us absurdly imagine—in favor of the Populist party, he could do it. We Catholics might conclude that in the platform of the Populist party there was nothing against the Ten Commandments, none of the errors condemned by the *curia* in the famous syllabus, and nothing damnable. We would read the respect of the Holy Father for Populist doctrines with respectful amazement and consideration. It might influence some votes, but not one of Tammany's. No Catholic would feel forced to obey the Pope under pain of loss of salvation. Dante was one of the best Catholics that ever lived, and yet, while exercising all the privileges of a communist—let us say, "in good standing"—he took violent part against the party of the Pope in Italian politics. Raphael, without rebuke from Rome—with the distinct approbation of Rome—put him among the doctors of the church in the *Disputa*. Dante did not scruple to cast Popes in hell itself. He misunderstood Celestine, and had his reasons for disliking Nicholas, and down they went. And yet I wish from my heart I were half as good a Catholic as that same Dante Alighieri. So much for the infallibility of the Pope in political matters!

"Thus," writes Cardinal Newman, in his answer to Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet on the Vatican Council, "if the Pope told the English Bishops to order their priests to stir themselves energetically in favor of teetotalism, and a particular priest was fully persuaded that abstinence from wine, etc., was practically a Gnostic error, and therefore felt that he could not so exert himself without sin; or suppose there was a Papal order to hold lotteries in each mission for some religious object, and a priest could say in God's sight that he believed lotteries to be morally wrong, that priest in either of these cases would commit a sin *hic et nunc* if he obeyed the Pope, whether he was right or wrong in his opinion, and if wrong although he had not taken proper pains to get at the truth of the matter."

In spite of this, Bishop Doane declares that the "pronounced principles of the Roman Church give the Church a right to control the political action of its members," implying that the conscience of the Pope when he considers secular conditions must override the consciences of all Catholics. This is a monstrous doctrine, and it seems impossible that Bishop Doane should seriously assert it, in the face of history and in the faces of his American Catholic fellow-citizens. The condition of Europe

has changed since Henry went to Canossa; the Pope is no longer the chosen arbiter of all Christendom; and he does not claim temporal rights which were his by the consent of the nations. Spain is the most Catholic nation of Europe,—yet suppose the Pope should declare against the present *régime* and in favor of Don Carlos, would the most pious of Catholics take his utterance as infallible? Would the American Catholics rush to the assistance of the Spanish Pretender for fear of an “interdict” or excommunication?

There is no more loyal Catholic in Europe than Count de Mun. If he had declined to follow the Holy Father in approving of a republic in France there would have been no excommunication, nor would his Catholicism be suspected. It would take too much space to show how limited are the opportunities for the exercise of that “infallibility” of which the Bishop of Albany so often speaks. The Encyclical *Pastor Æternus* explains these. He must interpret the “deposit of faith” left by the Apostles; he has not the “inspiration” of the Apostles; he can add nothing to the Moral Law. “If he enjoins,” says Cardinal Newman, “upon the Hierarchy of Ireland to withstand mixed education, this is no exercise of his infallibility.”

All of which ought to show that there are other points of view which would enable the gentlemen whom Bishop Doane represents to see things more clearly, if they would not put the blind eye against the telescope. There is no reason why Rome should love the public-school system; no reason why she should concern herself about it; but every reason why she should be anxious that her children should learn the truths of Christianity and the rules of Christian morality. Without these, “universal education” must be a failure from the point of view of thoughtful Christians. As a body, Catholics are not in opposition to the public-school system. Rome has not asked them to interfere with the rights of their neighbors; and when Rome does, it will be time enough to raise a “war-cry.” If Catholics were in the majority in this country, they would probably use their share of the school taxes to support their own schools, if they could. It would be a question of the ballot, as it is a question of the ballot now. After all, this school question is a local political question. If the plan of having Sisters teach in public schools has worked well in Poughkeepsie, why should it not work well in other places if the voters want it? It certainly has not destroyed the public-school system there. As the school system depends on votes, the patriotic enthusiasts on universal suffrage show a strange doubt of their God by not trusting it to the voters. If the Sisters turn out bad citizens, it is easy enough to turn them out of Poughkeepsie and everywhere else. Bishop Doane lacks confidence in American ideas, which, perhaps, are not as well understood as they might be in the old Dutch town of Albany. After what Bishop Doane has said—nearly all of which shows a singular neglect to put his keen eye to the telescope—we Catholics must feel that his desire to be kind and charitable exceeds his convictions. The Catholic Church “wields,” he said (“because it is a compact body”), “a power which cannot be but infinitely valuable, in its legitimate sphere of religious and moral control over its own people; and infinitely dangerous when it is exercised in matters that lie beyond its sphere.”

This is politeness and charity to a degree. He has told us that the claim of the Pope to dominate political affairs will not change. As good Roman Catholics, we are therefore, under the control of a foreign despot: how then can “Abraham and Lot live together”?—for, according to the Bishop

of Albany, we must either give up the Pope or go to the Devil. As we refuse to cease to consider the Holy Father as the Vicar of Christ and the preserver and *ex-cathedra* interpreter of the Scriptures and the Traditions of the Church, our friend might as well study our religious position,—or take our word that we are neither blind bigots nor malignant conspirators of the Catiline kind. As some of us have given hostages to society, it would be perhaps easier and kinder to take our word.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

THE PROBLEM OF THE RACING YACHT.

SINCE the beginning of the "Puritan era," in 1885, there has never been such inactivity in the building of racing yachts as there is this year. Hardly a racing keel of any size has been laid in the whole United States. For this, of course, the hard times are largely to blame. Yachts, and especially racing yachts, are essentially luxuries. It is natural that, after such hard times as we have had for the past year, when even the richest have felt the need of economizing, one of the first methods of reducing expenses would be the giving up of a projected racing craft.

But there are other things that have militated strongly against the building of new pleasure craft. The drift of the times has been recognized by the best judges, and many of these feel that there would be little more building than there is, even if the times were better.

Up to the time of the building of the "Puritan," American yacht building, while often very praiseworthy, had been spasmodic and irregular. With the defeat of the "Genesta" in 1885 our yacht designing became more uniformly scientific, and a definite "school" of American designing began to take shape. Not but that there were scientific American craft before the "Puritan," and some of them perhaps as clever for their day as she was for hers, but on the culmination of the sloop-cutter controversy in the new type, the building began to run all in one channel. The "rule-of-thumb" boats gradually disappeared, and Mr. Burgess, the designer of the successful "Puritan," naturally had a large share in the shaping of the new order of things.

Mr. Burgess was by taste and temperament essentially a cruising man. He liked the staunch little craft that could take his friends and himself snugly on a little cruise, or that could go out in the bay in a rough nor-easter, and bring her crew back without the starting of a scarpole joint, or the parting of a halliard. This quality was strikingly evident in all his earlier productions, and for years his new yachts were noticeable for their ability to stand hard weather, and their freedom from accidents.

With no spur except the necessity of beating himself, Mr. Burgess could continue for several years to turn out racing yachts, the fleet of one year only a trifle more extreme than the output of the preceding season, and all calculated for the double purpose of racing and cruising combined. To this day the racing boats of 1885 to 1890 are among the best cruisers of the fleet. But with the advent of competition all this was changed. Minerva shook things up a bit, and in various localities other designers began to pick up races. The necessity of making a substantial advance in speed from year to year set to work a hundred different devices, all of which tended to diminish the value of the ex-racers as cruising craft.